

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES AND DEVELOPMENT

700 North 10th Street, Room 258
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 341-4200
(916) 341-4203 (FAX)
(916) 327-6318 (TDD)



March 30, 2004

Subject: 2003 Community Services Block Grant Information System (CSBG/IS) Survey

Attached is the completed 2003 California Community Services Block Grant Information System (CSBG/IS) Survey that was submitted to The National Association for State Community Services Programs (NASCSPP) and concurrently to the Office of Community Services (OCS) on March 29, 2003. The information contained in this survey is aggregated with information provided by each state. The aggregated information will be reported in the 2003 National CSBG/IS Statistical Report prepared by NASCSPP. That report is then forwarded to OCS and Congress to illustrate the impact and outcomes of CSBG funded programs throughout the United States. Therefore, CSD would like to thank all the CSBG Agencies that submitted the 2003 CSBG/IS Survey.

The sections listed below are included in the report. In parenthesis following Sections D, E, F, G and Part II, Section B, the CSBG reporting form used to capture and aggregate this information has been included for reference.

Part I

- **Section A—State Allocations of FY 2003 CSBG Funds**
- **Section B—General Information on Local CSBG Agencies**
- **Section C—General Information on State CSBG Office**
- **Section D—Program and Management Accomplishments (CSD 090)**
- **Section E—CSBG Expenditures by Service Category (CSD 425.OF)**
- **Section F—Other Resources Administered and Generated by the CSBG Network (CSD 425.OR)**
- **Section G—Client Characteristics (CSD 295)**

Part II

- **Section A—Narrative Questions on Implementation of ROMA (CSD 090)**
- **Section B—Description of Outcome Measures and Results (CSD 415)**

Attachments

- **Attachment A—List of Eligible Entities**
- **Attachment B—Other HHS Resources**
- **Attachment C—Other Federal Sources**
- **Attachment D—Other State Sources**

Supporting Documentation

- **OCS Monitoring and Assessment Task Force (MATF): National Goals and Outcome Measures**
- **CSD 415 Statewide Aggregation by Goal Number** (the data on these excel worksheets is reported under Part II, Section D in NASCSPP's required format.)

Part I: Section A. State Use of CSBG Funds

1. State Reporting Period (month/day/year)

State Reporting:

From: 1/01/2003 to: 12/31/2003 (365 days)

California

2. Total CSBG funds expended in FY 2003 for:

	Planned	Actual
a. Eligible Entities	\$51,579,853	\$51,579,853
b. State Administrative Costs	\$2,865,547	\$2,865,547
c. Discretionary Projects	\$2,865,547	\$2,865,547
d. Total Funds	\$57,310,947	\$57,310,947
	\$0	\$0

3. Of the total in 2d., how much represents carryover funding from the previous fiscal year?

3.

4. Carry-forward of FY 2003 funds to FY 2004 programs

4.

5. State CSBG funds if any (see instructions)

5.

6. TOTAL Federal and State CSBG funds in FY 2003

6.

\$57,310,947

Part I: Section B. General Information on Local CSBG Agencies

State Reporting:

1. Eligible entities receiving FY 2003 funds:

(Please attach a list of eligible entities, their addresses, and their award amounts.)

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| a. Number of Community Action Agencies (CAAs) among eligible entities | <input type="text" value="54"/> |
| b. Number of Limited Purpose Agencies (LPAs) among eligible entities | <input type="text" value="4"/> |
| c. Number of organizations serving migrant or seasonal farmworkers | <input type="text" value="5"/> |
| d. number of these also counted in a or b | <input type="text" value="2"/> |
| e. Number of units of local government | <input type="text" value="25"/> |
| f. number of these also counted in a,b or c | <input type="text" value="25"/> |
| g. Others designated eligible by statute | <input type="text" value="3"/> |
| h. number of these also counted in a,b,c or e | <input type="text" value="1"/> |
| i. Total unduplicated number of eligible entities | <input type="text" value="63"/> |

2. Were previously funded eligible entities dropped in FY 2003?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Number:

(If yes, indicate number and reason.)

Reason:

California Council of Tribal Governments, Inc. (CCTG) funding was terminated on the grounds that CCTG has not maintained the level of board participation required by federal law or complied with the staffing & reporting requirements.

3. Substate allocation method:

(Please select the method that best describes the current practice for allocations within the state.)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Historic | <input type="radio"/> Hold Harmless + Formula |
| <input type="radio"/> Base + Formula | <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify): |
| <input type="radio"/> Formula Alone | <input type="text"/> |
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Formula with variables | |

Part I: Section B. General Information on Local CSBG Agencies

4. Coverage of counties

a. Percent of state's counties receiving CSBG services at year end from local CSBG operators 100 %

b. Number of counties newly receiving CSBG services in FY 2003 (if any)

(Please attach a list of counties newly receiving CSBG services in FY2003.)

5. Uses of Discretionary Project Funds (if listed in Section A, Item 2.c)

a. What types of organizations received the awards?

1. Indian Tribes or tribal organizations
2. Migrant or farmworker organizations
3. State subgrantee associations
4. Eligible entities
5. Other (please specify below):

Limited Purpose Agencies

1. \$100,000
2. \$80,000
3. \$100,000
4. \$2,152,784
5. \$432,763

Total Discretionary Funds Expended

a. \$2,865,547

b. For what purposes were the awards given?

1. Awards to local agencies for expansion to new areas
2. Competitive grants for exemplary or demonstration programs
3. Training or technical assistance for local agencies
4. Statewide Programs
5. General support
6. Other (please specify below):

Limited Purpose Agencies

1. \$246,436
2. \$35,000
3. \$50,000
4. \$75,000
5. \$2,026,348
6. \$432,763

Total Discretionary Funds Expended

b. \$2,865,547

The totals of a and b should match both each other and Item 2.c in Section A.

Part I: Section C. General Information on State CSBG Office

State Reporting:

California

1. Please identify the cabinet or administrative department of your state CSBG office.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="radio"/> Community Services Department | <input type="radio"/> Governor's Office |
| <input type="radio"/> Human Services Department | <input type="radio"/> Community Affairs Department |
| <input type="radio"/> Social Services Department | <input type="radio"/> Other (please specify): |

2. What is the division, bureau, or office of the CSBG Administrator?

California Department of Community Services and Development

3. Other programs directed by the CSBG Administrator in FY 2003:

a. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct Community Food and Nutrition Programs?

Yes ☒ No ☐

b. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct DOE Weatherization?

Yes ☒ No ☐

c. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct part or all of the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP)?

Yes ☒ No ☐

1) If yes, does he/she direct BOTH the fuel payments and crisis assistance LIHEAP programs?

Yes ☒ No ☐

2) or direct ONLY LIHEAP crisis assistance?

Yes ☐ No ☒

3) or direct ONLY LIHEAP energy conservation?

Yes ☐ No ☒

d. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct USDA programs? If yes, please list titles.

Yes ☐ No ☒

e. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct HUD programs? If yes, please list below:

Yes ☐ No ☒

f. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct any other federal programs for the homeless?

Yes ☐ No ☒

g. Does the CSBG Administrator also direct state Head Start programs?

Yes ☐ No ☒

h. How many other programs are also directed by the CSBG Administrator? (List titles of other programs below):

1

Utility Company Reduced Rate Program

4. Was the state CSBG office subject to a reorganization in FY 2003, such as an expansion or contraction of programs, or a transfer of the CSBG office to a different division or department?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If yes, please describe change (attach extra page if necessary):

California State General Funding ended for the Naturalization Services Program, Mentoring, Weatherization Energy Efficiency Rehabilitation Program and California Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

5. State statute regarding CSBG:

- a. Does your state have a statute authorizing Community Services programs? (If yes, please attach.)

Yes ☒ No ☐

- b. Did your state legislature enact authorizing legislation, or amendments to an existing authorizing statute during FY 2003?

Yes ☐ No ☒

Please check those items which describe provisions of the current statute

- 1) What is the termination date of the current statute?

(mm/dd/yy)

- 2) Does it "grandfather" CAAs?

Yes ☒ No ☐

- 3) Does it specify the terms, or formula, for allotting 90% pass-through funds among eligible entities?

Yes ☒ No ☐

- 4) Does it require local grantees to match CSBG funds?

Yes ☐ No ☒

- 5) Does it provide for the designation of new eligible entities?

Yes ☒ No ☐

- 6) Does it provide for the de-designation of eligible entities?

Yes ☒ No ☐

- 7) Does it specify a process the state CSBG agency must follow to re-designate an existing eligible entity?

Yes ☒ No ☐

- 8) Does it designate the bureau, division, or office in state government that is to be the state administering agency?

Yes ☒ No ☐

- 9) If it has other provisions please list them:

6. a. Did it cost more in FY 2003 than the federally allowed limit in your state's CSBG allocation for your state to effectively administer the range of services and activities required by the CSBG Act?

Yes ☐ No ☒

- b. If yes, what was the amount of these extra costs?

- c. If yes, were state funds used to supplement federal administrative expenditures?

Yes ☐ No ☒

- d. If yes, what was the amount of the supplemental state funds?

7. a. How many state positions were funded in whole or in part by CSBG funds?

92

- b. How many Full Time Equivalents (FTEs) were funded with CSBG funds?

26

Part I: Section D: Program and Management Accomplishments

1. **What do you consider to be the top three management or program accomplishments achieved by your state CSBG administering agency during your FY 2002 program year? Briefly describe them. These can pertain to the state agency itself, or to grantees.**
 - a. **Southern California Wildfires:** In October 2003, Southern California was devastated with the California Wildfires that consumed 736,860 acres and 4,800 structures in five counties. In response to this crisis, CSD released CSBG Discretionary funds to nine Community Action Agencies to assist in the emergency relief and rebuilding efforts. The funds were used for food, clothing, toiletries, sleeping bags, blankets, hotel/motel vouchers, gas cards, Department of Motor Vehicle (DMV) assistance, bus tickets, youth services, evacuation safety kits, air filter replacements, diapers, formula, medical assistance, rental assistance, and rental deposits for families affected by the fires. In addition, the funds were used to upgrade Ventura County's disaster center control room and improve its disaster readiness and response plan for future emergencies.
 - b. **Economic Opportunity Commission of San Luis Obispo (EOC of SLO):** CSD awarded EOC of SLO a \$50,000 discretionary award to create a San Luis Obispo County Housing Trust Fund. The Fund will receive, leverage, and disburse funds to develop a variety of affordable housing options for low-income individuals and families in San Luis Obispo. The funds will be used primarily to leverage start-up funding for the project as well as hire staff. Once established, the Fund will meet the ROMA Community Revitalization, Goal #2, by improving local conditions in which low-income people live by increasing the affordable housing supply. The Fund will significantly increase production of high quality, affordable homeownership and rental units through construction or rehabilitation of existing rental and owner-occupied units. During 2003, the start-up phase of this project, the Fund leveraged and secured \$304,000 from other sources, in addition to the \$50,000 CSBG Discretionary Funds. These funds will be matched by the County of San Luis Obispo to assist with additional start-up costs.
 - c. **Riverside County Department of Community Action:** CSD awarded Riverside County Department of Community Action a \$150,000 discretionary award to provide a variety of energy services to low-income priority populations (elderly, disabled, families with children under two years, migrant and working poor individuals and families). Riverside County Department of Community Action partnered with the Riverside County Board of Supervisors and the Energy Task Force in Riverside County to administer seven cooling centers and purchase energy equipment to be used by at-risk low-income households during the summer peak months of May through October 2003. Besides operating seven cooling centers, the agency purchased and installed: 330 evaporative coolers, 280 solar/battery operated flash lights, 55 generators, and 280 solar-powered motion sensor security lights to assist low-income households with their energy needs.

2. **Please provide at least three narrative or anecdotal accounts of how a local CSBG program (a) eliminated a cause of poverty, or (b) eliminated a condition of poverty so that one or more households were moved out of poverty status. Please indicate whether the activity was completely funded by the CSBG, or if not; why the CSBG was or was not important to the outcome.**

Riverside County Department of Community Action

Riverside County Department of Community Action Individual Development Account Program (RivCo IDA) is a low-income match savings incentive program that was initiated in 2000. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services awarded three separate 5-year demonstration grants totaling over \$500,000 to RivCo IDA. Savers are now beginning to see the benefits of their workshop attendance and skill-building activities. In this past year, two savers have started their own businesses, and six savers have purchased and moved into their own homes.

One participant, a single mother of eight children has worked her way to independence from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Section 8 Housing Assistance. She has become a first-time homebuyer in the City of Perris. "At first, I didn't believe that I could do it, but as I began to see my savings grow, I realized that I really could achieve my goals. I want to share what I have learned with others, so they can build their self-esteem and realize their dreams, just like I have." She currently works for the County of Riverside Department of Public Social Services. Shortly after she moved into her new home, she was involved in an auto accident, the victim of a drunk driver. She shared with the Program Coordinator that the problem-solving skills she learned while attending RivCo IDA classes helped her to manage her budget and attain an insurance settlement. Since then she has enrolled at Riverside Community College to take business-related classes that will help her advance in her job.

CSBG funds support the administrative costs associated with salaries of the program manager and support staff, a critical element to program success. Other major program funds needed involve the matching funds required by the federal grant; these have been secured through private donations and agency discretionary funds.

Monterey County Community Action Partnership

Family G consists of a young couple that had just arrived from another country looking for work and a better life. They have 2 sons, ages nine and four. Mrs. G's fourteen year-old brother also resides with them. The referral came in to the agency's Family Resource Center because the nine-year old did not want to go to school. He cried every day, would get sick at school, and was having a very difficult time adjusting. Mr. G or Mrs. G would have to go to school every day to assist with the situation. The Center's Family Case Manager spoke with the child at school and conducted an assessment. He appeared to be lonely and depressed. He was referred for a physical exam at a clinic with a sliding scale for payment, and he was placed on the waiting list at a child & teen-counseling clinic. In the meantime, the Family Case Manager continued to provide supportive

counseling to the child. Within a period of three weeks, he showed improvement and was better adjusted at school. In addition, his parents were referred to the Families In Control parenting series of classes. The Family Case Manager subsequently observed that these parents were successfully utilizing the parenting tools they had acquired in these classes.

The Family Case Manager encouraged Mr. and Mrs. G to register for the Parent Leadership Academy to learn about leadership and advocacy skills. The family followed through. The younger child was enrolled in Head Start and Mr. G volunteered in the classroom, attended school functions, and participated in meetings while his wife worked. Both parents have been volunteers at the Center and at community events. They have received formal recognition for their accomplishments. In addition, they have taken advantage of the English-as-a-Second Language (ESL) classes offered through this center.

When this family came to the center, they didn't have a stable home or employment. They were residing with relatives in a very small apartment. They then moved in with another relative and remained there for several months. They were without money and the Family Case Manager provided safety net services such as food and clothing as well as information on how to look for employment. Mrs. G found a job at a fast food restaurant, but Mr. G remained unemployed for several months. The Family Case Manager provided him with supportive counseling and career counseling. Mr. G eventually found employment in the agricultural industry and they were able to save money to move into their own apartment. The Center provided donations such as household items, food baskets, Christmas toys, etc.

After Mr. G's employment became more secure and he was employed fulltime, the family moved into a more spacious apartment. The teenage brother was recently employed as well in a fast food restaurant and Mr. G was promoted to another position within the first 5 months on the job. He also was told that he could earn another promotion this coming June if his English skills improve. Mr. G is working very hard towards making this possible.

This is a good example of how CSBG funding through the Community Action Partnership helped a family to eliminate a condition of poverty by partially paying for the salary of the Case Manager at the Family Resource Center to assist a family in their way to self-sufficiency.

Center for Employment Training

In response to the poverty experienced by many migrant seasonal farmworkers, Center for Employment Training (CET) offers job skill training enabling trainees to become economically self sufficient and to find year round unsubsidized full time employment. CET uses Community Service Block Grant (CSBG) funds to assist with training and to provide counseling, literacy, employment and emergency support for farmworkers.

Maria, now a CET Alumni, worked in the fields for about 6 months prior to attending Center for Employment Training. Her husband, Jose, has worked in the fields most of his life. Maria decided that she wanted to better her life and she wanted to help her husband to support their family of five.

After receiving employment counseling from Center for Employment Training in San Diego, Maria enrolled in the CET San Diego Welding Program. Maria received CSBG participant support for transportation to allow her to get back and forth to training daily. She also received clothing for herself and food for her family. These safety net services were essential to supporting Maria in achieving her training and employment goals. Maria also needed and attended Vocational English-as-a-Second Language Classes to assist her with her employment goals.

Upon completing the CET Welding Program, Maria was placed on employment with one of the Center for Employment Training partners, National Steel and Shipbuilding Company (NASSCO), as an entry-level welder. Maria's starting wage was \$8.14 per hour, with a possibility of promotion every 960 hours (6 months) upon completion of NASSCO required classes and tests. Although she has officially completed the CET Welding program, she continues to return to CET every 6 months when she is preparing for NASSCO's advancement test. CET is very proud of Maria because of her determination and desire. She has moved herself and family from 'stable' to 'thriving' as measured by the Family Development Matrix Indicator. Today, Maria is still employed with NASSCO and advancing up the ladder. She now earns \$15.62 per hour with benefits for her family.

The CSBG funds received by Center for Employment Training were a very important contributor to Maria's success.

3. **Please provide a description of three innovative programs funded by at least in part by the CSBG that have demonstrated success in eliminating a cause or causes of poverty and/or a condition(s) of poverty.**

Community Design Center

Community Design Center is a Limited Purpose Agency that provides architectural, planning and housing technical services related to organizations working to eliminate the conditions of poverty and improving communities in which low-income people reside/live.

In 2003, the Community Design Center completed architectural design and planning for the rehabilitation and code compliance of 8 residences occupied by low-income households. The Center's professional services were essential to obtain required building permits, approval of loans and public bidding processes, as well as providing guidelines to contractors. In addition to preparing working drawings and documents, the Center coordinates the work and participation of others throughout the life of the project.

The Center carries on its work in partnership, collaboration and coordination with consulting engineers, city loan agencies, building inspectors, and contractors.

CSBG is the major source funding for architectural services for the initial start-up and pre development and projects closeout services.

Community Action Partnership of San Diego

Earned Income Tax Credit Assistance: With an investment of just \$50,000 on January 28, 2003, the San Diego County Board of Supervisors set in motion a pilot project that brought over a million dollars in federal tax refunds to eligible families in North County and Central San Diego. Earned Income Tax Credit, provides income tax credits of up to \$3000 to low-income families, and has demonstrated success as a mechanism for lifting families out of poverty. With few additional resources, and in a short span of time, Community Action Partnership expanded the successful Earned Income Tax Credit services pilot project in 2003 through extensive planning and collaboration. The project became a model for intergovernmental cooperation and public/private partnerships. Partners included broad-based coalitions of government and local community organizations. In North County, the Agency partnered with the Internal Revenue Service, the City of Escondido, the City of Oceanside, the Office of Congressional Representative Randy "Duke" Cunningham, North County Collaboratives, Hope Through Housing Foundation, Home Start, Inc., Faith Based Development Corporation, Metropolitan Area Advisory Committee Project, and Bank of America. In the Central Region, the Agency partnered with the Bronze Triangle, LEAD San Diego, San Diego Neighborhood Funders Group, Home Start, Inc., Annie E. Casey Foundation, United Way, San Diego Urban League, Social Behavioral Research Institute (Cal State University, San Marcos) and Internal Revenue Service; these organizations collectively formed the Central Region Coalition for Building Family Wealth.

The effort targeted locations with high concentrations of poverty in North County and downtown San Diego. The Community Action Partnership created partnerships with local cities, community-based organizations, and financial institutions to provide information, free tax preparation, and enrollment information for public health insurance programs. With an investment of \$50,000 from the County of San Diego, these partnerships successfully assisted families in filing more than 800 tax returns that resulted in over \$1 million in federal refunds, including more than \$600,000 from Earned Income Tax Credit. The objective of the Earned Income Tax Credit pilot program was to assist low-income families in San Diego County to move toward self-sufficiency, promote financial literacy, and encourage enrollment of eligible families in no, or low-cost health insurance programs. Outreach efforts were expanded to inform low-income families and individuals about Earned Income Tax Credit. Availability of free tax preparation was also expanded via the Internal Revenue Service sponsored Volunteer Income Tax Assistance program (VITA). The volunteer tax preparations saved filers approximately \$83,000 in filing fees.

Because of limited resources, Community Action Partnership focused on leveraging services through contracting agencies, and volunteers. Besides the human resources that were leveraged, space, computers, printers and copy costs were also donated. In addition, some of the participating agencies received donations from local stores, such as Bed and Bath and Body Works, which were used as incentives for volunteers at one site in the County. One Volunteer Income Tax Assistance trained volunteer assisted 38 clients in filing their tax return. Clients received over \$40,000 in tax return refunds. Many clients were able to use this money to pay a security deposit on an apartment. Because of the success of this program, Community Action Partnership has adopted Earned Income Tax Credit, in conjunction with financial literacy services, as a

core strategy in helping low-income working families escape poverty. Community Action Partnership had a lead role in the development and planning process to form the San Diego County Earned Income Tax Credit Regional Collaborative and worked with other agencies in coordinating Earned Income Tax Credit services within the six Health and Human Services Agency regions in San Diego County.

Community Services and Employment Training (C-SET)

C-SET's support and coordination of the annual Make A Difference Day is a CSBG-supported strategy that helps to creatively solve community problems. C-SET has found that this national day of community service provides a creative first step in engaging residents in civic participation and building long-term civic capital. On October 25, 2003, C-SET rallied nearly 1,200 residents in 17 rural, impoverished communities to make a difference in their neighborhoods and communities. For example, Cutler-Orosi residents painted a park arbor, removed litter along 4 miles of highway, painted 50 curb addresses to help emergency vehicles identify homes, and provided outreach to 50 homes for the Cutler-Orosi Fire Department to install fire alarms. In Earlimart, volunteers cleared weeds to improve safety at four main intersections, removed trash along the freeway, planted ivy next to walls that were graffiti targets, and painted 100 addresses on house curbs. In Allensworth, residents cleaned its only community center to open it up for youth services in 2004, filling a 40-yard roll-off bin and three 9-yard bins. Volunteers also planted trees.

CSBG funding supported the involvement of C-SET staff, who coordinated this event, including recruiting volunteers; gaining the participation of local businesses, community- and faith-based organizations, and local government; helping residents identify community needs and plan activities; developing marketing materials and a how-to kit; recognizing volunteers and donors; entering the \$10,000 Make A Difference Day competition sponsored by USA Weekend Magazine; and creating evaluation forms to obtain feedback on the event from each community.

In Allensworth, this one-day event led residents to commit to meeting monthly to identify and tackle their community's challenges. Through CSBG funding, C-SET staff members are able to facilitate this monthly effort and build the capacity of Allensworth residents to find solutions to conditions of poverty in their community.

Community Action Agency of Tehama County

One of the subcontractors, Home Help for Hispanic Mothers, offers a leadership program that focuses on empowering women and improving communication skills to enhance civic participation in their communities.

This year the training model moved to a community-based focus rather than the countywide to enhance civic participation in specific school districts. The curriculum was expanded to monthly meetings and four workdays throughout the school year. Eight monthly meetings were scheduled for each site to provide orientation into the program, improve upon listening and speaking skills, time and money management and recognizing illness. In four in-depth workdays,

speakers from the community addressed the participants on topics of interest as well as provided small group time to process information.

Twenty women are currently participating in Red Bluff and fifteen women are participating from Gerber. Both sites are within walking distance of many of the participants' homes, thus, relieving the need for large groups of transportation.

As a follow-up to leadership, in June and July peer-instructed workshops were initiated. Classes meet two mornings a week. There, seven to ten participants come together with other women from the community who did not participate in Leadership, to receive instruction in hair cutting and coloring and sewing classes. Women from the Leadership programs who were professionally trained in Mexico taught the classes. The majority of the responsibility for organizing these classes and childcare has rested on the shoulders of the participants. Since the sessions were held during school vacation time, some school aged daughters ages 7 to 14 attended and were able to participate with their mothers in the activities.

The four-day Latina Leadership workshop served 24 women. The women returning for the second and third time (Level II) planned and executed a five-member panel of community members who spoke to them about health, finance, education and immigration. This activity gave the women supervised but direct involvement with the community at large. One important result of this activity was that the women felt a sense of worth based on their own capabilities rather than their economic situation. Through a follow-up phone survey, Home Help found that 13% found work outside of farm labor, 83% are involved with school programs and 57% are enrolled in an education program.

- 4. Please describe one project or activity that linked resources from several sources to mobilize or coordinate a solution to a poverty problem in the community. The point is to show CSBG "at work" as it funds staff activities, investments or services that meet a previously unmet community need. Please provide the following information: Program Name, Purpose, Need for the Program, CSBG Service Category, Role of your agency in program, Partners and Partner Roles, CSBG Involvement (planning, coordinating, funding, guaranteeing loans), Type of funding (monetary, in-kind services, etc.) contributed by each partner, Description of program, and Impact and Results.**

Community Action of Napa Valley

Program Name: Hope Center

Purpose: To provide a wide range of services for the most vulnerable street homeless population in Napa.

Need for the Program: The need for this program was determined by two independent studies – one by the Continuum of Care Committee of Napa County and the other, a very in depth study of homeless issues in Napa. This study was called Project Darrell, named after a homeless man who died on the streets of

Napa. The study was conducted by Homebase, a legal homeless advocacy group in San Francisco.

CSBG Service Category: Housing and Self-Sufficiency

Role of your agency in program: Community Action of Napa Valley (CANV) is the lead agency for this project. The agency received a three-year HUD grant through the City of Napa Housing Authority. The center is a large hall donated to this purpose by the First Methodist Church. The center serves the basic needs of homeless people by providing showers, laundry, mail and phone services, as well as co-located services to help this vulnerable population to increase self-sufficiency.

Partners and Partner Roles: There are multiple partners co-located at the Hope Center. CANV provides site managers to run the day-to-day operations, as well as a Housing Coordinator. Health Clinic Ole provides medical staff on site two days each week. Catholic Charities provides housing assistance. Napa County Health & Human Services received a grant, which provides three mental health practitioners to access and work with the mentally ill homeless population. This innovative project works from a “housing first” model and has been very effective in moving mentally ill homeless individuals into housing and treatment. Progress Foundation provides outreach to the street homeless population. The local Workforce Invest Board has provided a computer system for job seeking purposes.

CSBG Involvement: Napa County is a minimum funded agency. CSBG funding is used for increasing CANV’s administrative capacity; thereby decreasing the administrative fee that CANV must charge its programs. This allows programs to spend a greater portion of their funding on direct client services. CSBG funding provides management oversight of this program – in the areas of programmatic monitoring, fiscal services and Human Resources.

Type of funding contributed by each partner: The Hope Center was initially funded with a three-year grant from HUD. This included some funding for renovations. CANV also obtained money from the Napa Valley Wine Auction and Napa County to finish the renovations. The building that houses the Hope Center is an old church hall that CANV rents from the First Methodist Church for \$1.00/year. CANV’s funding for this project comes from HUD, Federal Emergency Shelter Grant, Emergency Housing Assistance Program, and City of Napa.

Description of program: The Center provides basic services for the homeless population such as showers, laundry facilities, mail service and phones. CANV also provides housing assistance and case management. The Center also provides the following services: 1) medical services are provided twice weekly by Community Health Clinic Ole; 2) Outreach and case management services are provided by Progress Foundation; 3) Housing assistance is provided by Catholic Charities; 4) Help with deposits on housing provided by the San Francisco Chronicle’s Season of Sharing Fund; 5) Mental Health case management and services are provided by Napa County Health & Human Services; 6) Drug and Alcohol services are provided by Napa County Health and Human Services; 7) Job training and development provided by Napa County’s WIB programs.

Impact and Results: During 2003, 276 individuals were served. 109 found stable housing, 96 found employment, 48 provided mental health services, 49 entered day treatment for substance issues and 9 entered residential treatment.

5. **Please provide a brief description of one youth-focused and one senior-focused initiative that describes how the CSBG funds that you listed in Table 2 of the CSD 425.OF were used and coordinated with other programs and resources. Please include the following: Population, Brief description of initiative, Amounts contributed by other programs, and partners, Role of other programs and partners, and Results and impact.**

Orange County Community Development Council, Inc.

Population: Low-income Teens (12 to 18 years)

Brief description of initiative: The agency operates two Family Resource Centers with teen programs that provide continuation school, leadership development, social recreation programs, gang prevention, counseling, and job development.

Amounts contributed by other programs, and partners: CSBG funds provide administrative support, leverages other funding streams, and coordinate family services in collaboration from other services providers. The Centers received \$600,000 in County Social Services Agency Families and Communities Together (FaCT) funding in 2003. The Centers were supplemented with approximately \$100,000 in local Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding from the County Housing and Community Services Department. Approximately 15 partners, including private and public agencies provided services such as emergency food, counseling, gang prevention and youth counseling, nutrition education, mentoring, leadership development and health services. Partners included: Sheriff's Department, Probation Department, Social Services Agency, Health Care Agency, Community Services Program, Inc (CSP), Orange County Parents Together (OCPT), YWCA of Orange, Family Assessments Counseling and Evaluation (FACES), and the Salvation Army. In terms of volunteer support and leveraging, Partners contributed over \$832,500.

Role of other programs and partners: The agency provided staffing and operated the Centers that coordinated services with collaborators and partners to provide a wide array of needed family and youth services to the community.

Results and impact: Over 333 youths received computers to improve educational outcomes with close to 80% indicating improvement in school. 1051 participated in youth development programs, and 33% gained employment.

Madera County Community Action Agency, Inc.

Population: Seniors

Brief description of initiative: Through a collaborative partnership with the Madera County Department of Social Services, Madera Adult School and the Fresno Madera Area Agency on Aging, MCCAA offers a much needed program

for grandparents (seniors), over the age of 60, who are raising their grandchildren – Grandparents As Parents Again Program (GAPA).

The objective of the GAPA program is to provide the foundation necessary for the development of whole and healthy family environments. This process begins with the education of relative caregivers over the age of 60, on their rights and responsibilities through, psychological, emotional and peer support groups, peer companionship and guidance.

Amounts contributed by other programs, and partners: The Fresno Madera Area Agency on Aging and Madera County Department of Social Services provided \$16,220.00.

Role of other programs and partners: The Madera Adult School provides parent education classes and support group sessions weekly. The Department of Social Services provides monthly orientations for relatives who are submitting applications to receive their family members that are in protective custody, referring those over the age of 60 to attend the GAPA sessions.

Results and impact: Parent development and education is measured by the increased number of relative caregivers over the age of 60 who are involved in their grandchildren's educational, social and mental development activities.

An increase in caregiver home approval status is measured by the number of caregivers over the age of 60 granted a relative approval status by the Department of Social Services. Providing a secure relative placement for children will move children from foster homes to their family.

CSBG Expenditures by Service Category

SUMMARY

Table 1: Funding By Service Category and Funding Source, FY 2003	
Service Category	CSBG Funds
1. Employment	9,052,347.45
2. Education	7,513,043.68
3. Income Management	686,101.54
4. Housing	2,973,980.69
5. Emergency Services	4,635,722.88
6. Nutrition	5,222,629.21
7. Linkages	6,584,495.62
8. Self Sufficiency	13,902,294.79
9. Health	1,327,833.11
10. Other*	0.00
Totals:	51,898,448.97

* Description of the programs(s) included in "Other" service category:

Of the CSBG funds reported above, \$ 13,877,124.79 were for administration.

Table 2: Of the Funding Listed in Table 1: Funds for Services by Demographic Category, FY 2003	
Demographic Category	CSBG Funds
1. Youth (Aged 12-18)	4,218,890.69
2. Seniors (Aged 55 and up)	2,939,889.10

Other Resources Administered and Generated

SUMMARY

Subsection I.

1. Amount of FY 2003 CSBG Contract

1. \$ 53,307,124.00

2. Federal Resources (other than CSBG)

a.	Weatherization (DOE) (include oil overcharge \$\$)	2a.	\$ 3,214,268.20
b.	LIHEAP Fuel Assistance (HHS) (include oil overcharge \$\$)	2b.	\$ 15,586,388.02
c.	LIHEAP Weatherization (HHS) (include oil overcharge \$\$)	2c.	\$ 20,166,048.60
d.	Head Start (HHS)	2d.	\$ 185,953,134.00
e.	Early Head Start (HHS)	2e.	\$ 18,102,712.00
f.	Older Americans Act (HHS)	2f.	\$ 5,655,913.13
g.	SSBG (HHS)	2g.	\$ 40,546.00
h.	Medicare/Medicaid (HHS)	2h.	\$ 1,917,080.00
i.	Community Food and Nutrition (HHS)	2i.	\$ 1,926,974.00
j.	Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF)	2j.	\$ 38,788,737.61
k.	Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG)	2k.	\$ 16,188,972.00

l. Other HHS resources (list in order of size):

1)	See Attachment B	\$ 6,312,318.00
2)		\$
3)		\$
4)		\$

Total HHS Other:

m.	WIC (USDA)	2l.	\$ 6,312,318.00
n.	All USDA Non-Food Programs (e.g. rural development)	2m.	\$ 24,072,249.00
o.	All Other USDA Food Programs	2n.	\$ 3,882,275.00
p.	CDBG - Federal, State, and Local	2o.	\$ 26,754,354.00
q.	Housing Programs (HUD)	2p.	\$ 23,764,207.14
	q1. Section 8	2q1.	\$ 12,146,792.00
	q2. Section 202	2q2.	\$ 1,336,301.00
r.	All other HUD including homeless programs	2r.	\$ 10,528,847.77
s.	Employment and training programs (US DOL)	2s.	\$ 65,313,599.28
t.	Other US DOL programs	2t.	\$ 5,382,201.00
u.	Corporation for National Services (CNS) Programs	2u.	\$ 1,871,862.00
v.	FEMA	2v.	\$ 1,097,042.36
w.	Transportation (US DOT)	2w.	\$ 1,180,420.00

x. Other Federal Sources (list in order of size):

1)	See Attachment C	\$ 4,151,448.22
2)		\$
3)		\$
4)		\$

Total Federal Other: 2x. \$ 4,151,448.22

TOTAL: NON-CSBG FEDERAL RESOURCES

\$ 495,334,690.33

CSBG/IS 2003

Other Resources Administered and Generated

SUMMARY

Subsection II. -- State Resources

a. State appropriated funds used for the same purpose as federal CSBG funds	a.	\$	
b. State housing and homeless programs	b.	\$	2,183,786.00
c. State nutrition programs	c.	\$	1,195,700.00
d. State day care and early childhood programs	d.	\$	44,022,169.00
e. State energy programs	e.	\$	5,682,900.06
f. State health programs	f.	\$	6,200,005.00
g. State youth development programs	g.	\$	4,426,540.03
h. State employment and training programs	h.	\$	10,504,764.61
i. State Head Start Programs	i.	\$	0.00
J. State senior programs	j.	\$	2,683,872.00
k. State Transportation Programs	k.	\$	2,579,079.00
l. State Education Programs	l.	\$	7,356,339.53
m. State Community and Economic Development Programs	m.	\$	1,921,035.00
n. State Rural Development Programs	n.	\$	229,972.00
o. Other State Sources (list in order of size)	Funding Amount		
1) See ATTACHMENT D			5,522,128.00
2)			
3)			
4)			
5)			
6)			
7)			
8)			
9)			
10)			
11)			
12)			
13)			
ALL OTHER:			
		<u>Total Funding</u>	
		<u>Amount,</u>	
		<u>Other State</u>	
		o.	\$ 5,522,128.00

TOTAL: STATE RESOURCES

\$ 94,508,290.23

If any of these resources were also reported under Subsection I (Federal Resources), please estimate the amount.

\$ 642,820.00

Other Resources Administered and Generated

SUMMARY

Subsection III. -- Local Resources

a.	Amount of unrestricted funds appropriated by local government	a.	\$ 24,229,631.00
b.	Value of Contract Services	b.	\$ 13,322,376.33
c.	Value of in-kind goods/services received from local government	c.	\$ 1,005,433.20

TOTAL: LOCAL RESOURCES	\$ 38,557,440.53
<i>If any of these resources were also reported under Subsection I or II, please estimate the amount.</i>	\$ 1,134,598.00

Subsection IV. -- Private Sector Resources

a.	Funds from foundations, corporations, United Ways, other non-profits	a.	\$ 24,352,996.68
b.	Other donated funds	b.	\$ 5,607,007.11
c.	Value of other donated items, food clothing, furniture, etc.	c.	\$ 15,005,688.57
d.	Value of in-kind services received from businesses	d.	\$ 3,381,270.00
e.	Fees paid by clients for services	e.	\$ 6,665,221.42
f.	Payments by private entities for goods or services for low-income clients or communities	f.	\$ 6,321,875.00
g.	Number of volunteer hours donated** **Volunteer Hours must be reported if the agency reported Head Start or Early Head Start funds in Subsection I.	g.	2,136,515

TOTAL: PRIVATE SECTOR RESOURCES	\$ 61,334,058.78
<i>If any of these resources were also reported under Subsection I, II or III, please estimate the amount.</i>	\$ 0.00

TOTAL	ALL OTHER RESOURCES (FEDERAL, STATE, LOCAL, PRIVATE) less amount of double count in Subsection II, III, IV	\$ 687,957,061.87
--------------	---	--------------------------

CSBG/IS 2003

Semi-Annual Summary Report

Please report demographic client data for both Family Development Clients and Safety Net Clients on this form. Note: Complete demographics are required for Family Development Clients and agencies should make every attempt to collect demographic data on Safety Net Clients.

2 Total unduplicated number of persons about whom one or more characteristics were obtained	1,401,455
3 Total unduplicated number of persons about whom no characteristics were obtained	298,213
4 Total unduplicated number of families about whom one or more characteristics were obtained	370,680
5 Total unduplicated number of families about whom no characteristics were obtained	187,549

6. Gender	Number of Persons*
a. Male	660,249
b. Female	719,972
*Total	1,380,221

7. Age	Number of Persons*
a. 0-5	113,178
b. 6-11	41,366
c. 12-17	55,956
d. 18-23	39,801
e. 24-44	124,822
f. 45-54	46,634
g. 55-69	85,807
h. 70+	66,923
*Total	574,487

8. Ethnicity/Race	Number of Persons*
a. Black/Not Hispanic	52,052
b. White/Not Hispanic	174,830
c. Hispanic Origin	235,266
d. Native American/Alaskan	13,964
e. Asian/Pacific Islander	74,640
f. Other	26,052
*Total	576,804

9. Education Level of Adults	Number of Persons 24+**
a. 0-8	44,493
b. 9-12/non-graduate	56,169
c. High sch. Grad./GED	68,689
d. 12+ some post secondary	29,400
e. 2 or 4 yr. College graduates	11,435
**Total	210,186

10. Other Characteristics	Number of Persons*
	# of Persons # Surveyed
a. No Health insurance	96,796 289,067
b. Disabled	43,030 229,112

11. Family Type	Number of Families***
a. Single parent/female	64,303
b. Single parent/male	10,179
c. Two-parent household	80,751
d. Single person	62,312
e. Two adults - no children	22,958
f. Other	13,047
***Total	253,550

12. Family Size	Number of Families ***
a. One	62,668
b. Two	42,870
c. Three	44,565
d. Four	36,598
e. Five	24,642
f. Six	12,625
g. Seven	5,360
h. Eight or more	7,020
***Total	236,348

13. Source of Family Income	Number of Families
a. Unduplicated # of Families Reporting One or More Sources of Income***	219,756
b. No income	39,051
c. TANF	39,228
d. SSI	45,242
e. Social Security	50,959
f. Pension	7,613
g. General Assistance	10,353
h. Unemployment Insurance	16,137
i. Employment + other source	23,016
j. Employment only	64,912
k. Other:	22,116

14. Level of Family Income % of HHS guideline	Number of Families ***
a. Up to 50%	74,118
b. 51% to 75%	43,975
c. 76% to 100%	34,900
d. 101% to 125%	22,413
e. 126% to 150%	67,275
f. 151% and over	6,033
***Total	248,714

15. Housing	Number of Families ***
a. Own	39,295
b. Rent	164,634
c. Homeless	18,668
d. Other	22,724
***Total	245,321

16. Other family characteristics	Number of Families
a. Farmer	8,116
b. Migrant Farmworker	13,121
c. Seasonal Farmworker	25,377

* The sum in this category should not exceed the value of item 2.

** The sum in this category should not exceed the value of item 7e-h.

*** The sum in this category should not exceed the value of item 4.

Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2003

Section A: Narrative Description

- 1. What activities occurred in your state to further the implementation of Results Oriented Management and Accountability (ROMA) and the use of outcome data for service, management, and reporting purposes?**
- 2. What challenges emerged during this effort? How were they met? Please attach additional pages as necessary.**

CSD continues to provide training and technical assistance to our Network through Annual Workshops. In addition, CSD's Field Representatives monitor each agency's progress in implementing ROMA throughout the year via on-site visits, desk reviews, and reporting forms. Below are some examples of agencies that have successfully implemented and improved ROMA implementation to improve services to clients and leverage additional funds.

Central Valley Opportunity Center

Central Valley Opportunity Center (CVOC) began the implementation of ROMA approximately 5 years ago. During the process, CVOC began to design results oriented reporting and tracking systems. The process started with the establishment of competency based classroom training and tracking of student vocational and educational attainment. CVOC's goal in providing and tracking of services is to design and operate programs that meet the needs of the target group and result in outcomes that impact the clients and communities they serve. ROMA requirements have only strengthened the programs and services provided by CVOC by creating a vehicle to track and monitor the impact of CVOC programs and services. CVOC implemented tracking methods for each of the various activities and services. CVOC created documents and systems to establish measurable benchmarks for each activity and service. The benchmarks were created to determine program successes and failures. CVOC provides Case Management services and develops individualized client plans. Client's progress is tracked using this path and benchmarks to determine the level of progress made towards their goals.

CVOC has participated in ROMA training provided by CSD. CVOC Management staff providing training and technical assistance to field staff in the documentation and collection of data required for reporting. Although CVOC does not have a complete automated system for tracking all data, the current Management Information System (Client Tracking) is adequate to track and generate a variety of reports to report client outcomes.

CVOC has been successful in increasing funding and maintaining current programs through the use of ROMA systems. The results and program accomplishments are key to CVOC success in obtaining Federal, State and local funding for a variety of programs.

Although CVOC was successful in establishment of ROMA tracking systems in-house, the challenge was in obtaining information from partners in the community. Due to limited staff and time constraints of other agencies, it was not always feasible for the community partners to collect the data in the manner prescribed by ROMA. Since most agencies have their own set of report requirements, the focus is to collect data in the manner dictated by their major funding source/s. CVOC continues to work with community partners in the implementation of a ROMA tracking system that will work within their time constraints and reporting systems. Through collaborative programs and approaches to providing services, CVOC seeks to be a leader in the community in terms of results oriented management.

Orange County Community Development Council, Inc.

Orange County Community Development Council, Inc. (Orange CDC) staff attended ROMA training workshops provided by State CSBG agency, State Community Action Association, United Way and Community Action Partnership. The Planning and Program Development Department of the agency provided three workshops to Program Directors and Managers to improve implementation of ROMA. Orange CDC transitioned to the new State reporting forms with little or no problems. One new outcome form was developed. An Orange CDC Universal Database Committee was formed to develop universal intake forms, data collection and reporting. The initial stage was completed in 2003 with an assessment of current databases and reporting requirements. Orange CDC developed a universal demographic form and an universal intake form and is researching web-based ROMA outcomes services and software.

Orange CDC is challenged by the lack of resources to implement ROMA at the level they desire, however they are working with the resources they have available. In addition, Orange CDC is challenged in identifying funding to launch web-based reporting and to provide consultant resources to help the agency create an agency-wide database. Program staff continues to struggle using outcomes in everyday delivery of services.

To meet these challenges, the Universal Database Committee continues to research resources and technology. The Planning Department continues to make Program Staff aware of the need to improve ROMA outcome reporting and provide training. Planning Staff works with each program to improve reporting. Planning staff continues to research and write grants for improving outcomes. Funding is needed for an outside consultant to evaluate each program and to develop new reporting forms. Orange CDC has interviewed two consultant agencies but lack the funding to go forward.

Amador-Tuolumne Community Action Agency

During 2003, Amador-Tuolumne Community Action Agency (A-TCAA) conducted an organizational assessment survey and began development of a Capacity Building Plan. The assessment was conducted to enhance A-TCAA's ability to function efficiently, adapt to new opportunities, and plan for further needs as Amador and Tuolumne counties grow and change. Several key concerns created the A-TCCAA environment that led to the assessment: 1) Ensuring that A-TCAA's infrastructure will support program growth and change with appropriate staffing, maintaining efficient administrative systems, sustainable funding, leadership development, and strategic planning; and 2) the current funding landscape which includes both actual and anticipated cuts from all funding sources.

The Capacity Building Action Team, which took the lead in assessment activities, represented a cross section of A-TCAA, including Board Members, Executive Director, management staff, line staff, fiscal staff, and a former long-term employee. The capacity assessment also crossed outside A-TCAA to include interviews with members of the Amador County Board of Supervisors, Executive Director of the Sonora Area Foundation, Board President of Amador-Tuolumne Community Resources, Program Manager for Tuolumne County Department of Social Services, and the Director of Amador County Health and Human Services.

A-TCAA staff and Board members were encouraged to participate in the organizational assessment survey, which was available in both paper and on-line format. The survey had a 70 percent response rate.

Survey results showed A-TCAA's governance and environment support its mission and capacity to achieve results. Survey results included: 93 percent of staff understand A-TCAA's vision and mission; 91 percent is aware of the shared values and beliefs that guide the organization; 89 percent agree the A-TCAA activities reflect and support its mission and values; 76 percent agree that programs and departments work well together; 90 percent agree A-TCAA reaches the population it aims to reach; and 73 percent agree client satisfaction is assessed regularly and actions are taken based on this information.

The organizational assessment resulted in a Capacity Building Action Plan currently being implemented. The Action Plan recommendations include the following areas: Mission and Planning; Fund Development; Human Resources; Culture, Communication, and Leadership; Information Technology, Facilities, and Equipment; Program; Governance; and Financial Management.

Obstacles to conducting an organizational assessment include funding, time, and commitment. Funding was provided by the Sierra Health Foundation, and the process was managed by Compass Point of San Francisco. A-TCAA was one of six

organizations that applied for and was accepted to participate in this pilot project. In return, A-TCAA committed staff and board time for meetings (approximately 30 hours of meeting time per team participant), access to documents, administration of the survey, and other time related requirements.

Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2003

Section B: Description of Measures and Results

Total number of agencies reporting: **64**

Total CSBG Funding in agencies reporting in this section: **\$ 51,579,853**

Chart 1. Family Goals: Low-Income people become more self-sufficient (CSBG Goal 1).

OCS Measure Letter	Eligible Entities Reporting	Service Category	Type of Unit	# of Units (# to be served)	Expected to Achieve Outcome (Goal)	Achieved	Still Progressing Toward Outcome	Exited Program Prior to Achieving Outcome
q	52	Education	Adults	5,028	2,404	1,759	2,037	314
s	52	Education	Adults	3,178	2,395	1,842	1,676	575
q	52	Education	Youth	7,927	5,782	7,143	1,910	527
s	52	Education	Youth	7,339	4,588	6,395	1,653	463
l	52	Education	People	5,039	3,368	3,243	1,141	460
m	52	Education	People	3,417	2,337	3,050	1,425	420
q	52	Employment	Households	6,633	3,851	3,577	2,759	772
s	52	Employment	Households	5,084	4,315	3,274	2,356	1,273
a	52	Employment	Participants	3,756	3,072	3,151	1,850	819
q	52	Income Management	Households	36,729	35,731	68,122	2,147	234
s	52	Income Management	Households	38,874	37,659	69,651	751	683
f	52	Income Management	Households	35,368	17,639	33,318	254	109
q	52	Linkages -- Transportation & Mobility	Households	1,245	875	1,096	292	56
s	52	Linkages -- Transportation & Mobility	Households	1,847	1,418	1,241	377	277
q	52	Housing	Households	3,037	2,392	5,309	1,257	468
s	52	Housing	Households	4,123	3,114	4,534	1,225	1,013
i	52	Housing	Families	2,095	979	1,430	622	231
j	52	Housing	Households	458	202	179	111	14
k	52	Housing	Minority Households	370	190	147	62	9
Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E	Column F	Column G	Column H	Column I

Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2003

Chart 2. Family Goals: Low-Income, Especially Vulnerable Populations, Achieve Their Potential by Strengthening Family and Other Supportive Environments (CSBG Goal 6).

<i>OCS Measure Letter</i>	<i>Eligible Entities Reporting</i>	<i>Service Category</i>	<i>Type of Unit</i>	<i># of Units (# to be served)</i>	<i>Expected to Achieve Outcome (Goal)</i>	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>Still Progressing Toward Outcome</i>	<i>Exited Program Prior to Achieving Outcome</i>
k	56	Nutrition	Households	228,867	204,628	241,008	26,565	42,894
m	56	Nutrition	Households	962,685	948,522	764,355	10,893	67,425
c	56	Emergency Services	Households	628,459	615,191	887,639	7,320	465
g	56	Emergency Services	Households	25,056	20,788	25,213	953	65
k	56	Emergency Services	Households	1,101,561	778,472	1,017,178	2,939	585
m	56	Emergency Services	Households	496,822	413,362	589,373	3,070	507
k	56	Health	Households	12,983	11,254	9,571	694	2,476
m	56	Health	Households	5,815	1,910	2,248	70	36
k	56	Health -- Social & Emotional Health Competency	Households	4,876	4,240	4,046	607	765
m	56	Health -- Social & Emotional Health Competency	Households	3,888	1,403	2,525	100	137
k	56	Health--Family Relations and Parenting	Households	3,685	2,585	2,346	717	646
m	56	Health--Family Relations and Parenting	Households	6,102	3,433	2,475	383	178
e	56	Linkages--Community Involvement	Households	2,088	1,230	2,645	857	423
f	56	Linkages--Community Involvement	Households	2,692	1,783	3,187	1,047	30
k	56	Linkages--Community Involvement	Households	543	438	510	55	28
m	56	Linkages--Community Involvement	Households	2,916	2,794	3,256	631	11
k	56	Housing	Households	2,034	1,141	2,151	453	228
m	56	Housing	Households	4,929	4,679	6,474	2,679	253
d	56	Housing	Families	1,405	935	1,098	518	136
Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E	Column F	Column G	Column H	Column I

Part II: Outcomes of Efforts, FY 2003

Chart 3. Community Goals: The Conditions in Which Low-Income People Live are Improved (CSBG Goal 2).

<i>OCS Measure Letter</i>	<i>Eligible Entities Reporting</i>	<i>Service Category</i>	<i>Type of Unit</i>	<i># of Units (# to be served)</i>	<i>Expected to Achieve Outcome (Goal)</i>	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>Still Progressing Toward Outcome</i>	<i>Exited Program Prior to Achieving Outcome</i>
c	10	Linkages -- Public Policy & Equity	Funds		1,233,615	1,233,615		
d	10	Linkages -- Public Policy & Equity	Increased Access		1,257,694	1,276,403		
i	10	Linkages -- Public Policy & Equity	Communities	12	12	12		
j	10	Linkages -- Public Policy & Equity	Communities	7	7	8		
Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E	Column F	Column G	Column H	Column I

Part II: Outcomes of CSBG Services, FY 2003

Chart 4. Community Goals: Low-Income People Own a Stake in Their Community (CSBG Goal 3).

<i>OCS Measure Letter</i>	<i>Eligible Entities Reporting</i>	<i>Service Category</i>	<i>Type of Unit</i>	<i># of Units (# to be served)</i>	<i>Expected to Achieve Outcome (Goal)</i>	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>Still Progressing Toward Outcome</i>	<i>Exited Program Prior to Achieving Outcome</i>
b	17	Linkages-- Service & Support Systems, Civic Capital, & Economic Opportunity	Funds		18,200,322.00	18,527,073.00		
e	17	Linkages-- Service & Support Systems, Civic Capital, & Economic Opportunity	People	5,057	3,307.00	3,436.00	342	
i	17	Linkages-- Service & Support Systems, Civic Capital, & Economic Opportunity	Communities	297	283	678	13	
j	17	Linkages-- Service & Support Systems, Civic Capital, & Economic Opportunity	Communities	107	48	36	16	
Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E	Column F	Column G	Column H	Column I

Part II: Outcomes of CSBG Services, FY 2003

Chart 5. Agency Goals: Partnerships Among Supporters and Providers of Services to Low-Income People are Achieved (CSBG Goal 4).

<i>OCS Measure Letter</i>	<i>Eligible Entities Reporting</i>	<i>Service Category</i>	<i>Type of Unit</i>	<i># of Units (# to be served)</i>	<i>Expected to Achieve Outcome (Goal)</i>	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>Still Progressing Toward Outcome</i>	<i>Exited Program Prior to Achieving Outcome</i>
a	37	Linkages -- Collaboration	Partnerships	1,254	1,238	1,444	21	
b	37	Linkages -- Collaboration	Partnerships	461	458	653	9	
c	37	Linkages -- Collaboration	Partnerships	776	774	789	21	
g	37	Linkages -- Collaboration	Agencies			23		
i	37	Linkages -- Collaboration	Agencies			34		
j	37	Linkages -- Collaboration	Agencies			34		
k	37	Linkages -- Collaboration	Agencies			25		
Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E	Column F	Column G	Column H	Column I

Part II: Outcomes of CSBG Services, FY 2003

Chart 6. Agency Goals: Agencies Increase Their Capacity to Achieve Results (CSBG Goal 5).

<i>OCS Measure Letter</i>	<i>Eligible Entities Reporting</i>	<i>Service Category</i>	<i>Type of Unit</i>	<i># of Units (# to be served)</i>	<i>Expected to Achieve Outcome (Goal)</i>	<i>Achieved</i>	<i>Still Progressing Toward</i>	<i>Exited Program Prior to Achieving Outcome</i>
a	47	Linkages	Dollars		\$172,213,350.00	\$223,191,662.90		
b	47	Linkages	Dollars			\$29,623,639.00		
c	47	Linkages	Agencies		21	28		
d	47	Linkages	Programs	165	156	173	45	
e	47	Linkages	Programs	164	158	161	53	
f	47	Linkages	Families	13,619	11,363	11,379	2,468	874
h	47	Linkages	Agencies			36		
i	47	Linkages	Agencies			32		
j	47	Linkages	Agencies			41		
k	47	Linkages	Agencies			40		
l	47	Linkages	Agencies			40		
m	47	Linkages	Development Contacts	1,235	732	1,733	61	
n	47	Linkages	Special Populations	72	69	72	9	1
q	47	Linkages	Agencies			41		
r	47	Linkages	Agencies			39		
s	47	Linkages	Agencies			42		
t	47	Linkages	Agencies			36		
u	47	Linkages	Agencies			39		
v	47	Linkages	Agencies			40		
o	47	Emergency Services	Clients	295,525	273,205	584,746	5,072	2,089
Column A	Column B	Column C	Column D	Column E	Column F	Column G	Column H	Column I

Attachment A

List of Eligible Entities

California Department of Community Services and Development (CSD)
2003 CSBG/IS Part I, Section B
List of Eligible Entities Receiving 2003 Funds

Contract Number	Agency	Address	Public or Private Agency	2003 Award Amount**
Community Action Agencies				
4300	Amador-Tuolumne CAA	935 South State Hwy. 49 Jackson, CA 95642	Public	\$223,556
4301	Associated Community Action Program	24100 Amador Street, 6th Floor Hayward, CA 94544-1203	Public	\$548,558
4302	Berkeley CAA	2180 Milvia Street, 2nd Floor Berkeley, CA 94704	Public	\$215,776
4303	CAA of Butte	2255 Del Oro Avenue Oroville, CA 95965	Private	\$353,251
4304	Calaveras-Mariposa CAA	5200 Highway 49 -- North Mariposa, CA 95338	Private	\$173,556
4305 & 4366	Campesinos Unidos (CUI)	1005 C Street Brawley, CA 92227	Private	\$349,758
4306	Center for Community and Family Services	37 E. Villa Street Pasadena, CA 91103	Private	\$396,882
4307	Community Services & Employment Training	909 West Murray Visalia, CA 93291	Private	\$781,229
4308	Contra Costa County Community Services Dept	2520 Stanwell Drive, Suite 200 Concord, CA 94520	Public	\$645,787
4309	Economic and Social Opportunities (ESO)	1445-47 Oakland Road San Jose, CA 95112	Private	\$1,228,112
4310	El Dorado County Dept of Community Services	937 Spring Street Placerville, CA 95667	Public	\$173,556
4311	Fresno EOC	1920 Mariposa Mall, Suite 300 Fresno, CA 93721	Private	\$1,675,530
4312	Glenn County Human Resource Agency	420 East Laurel Street Willows, CA 95988	Public	\$173,556
4313 & 4352	Inyo Mono Advocates for Community Action	224 S. Main Street Bishop, CA 93515	Private	\$175,679
4314	Kern County Economic Opportunity Council	300 -- 19th Street Bakersfield, CA 93301-4502	Private	\$1,181,608
4315	Kings Community Action Organization	1222 West Lacey Blvd., Suite 201 Hanford, CA 93230-5998	Private	\$192,336
4316	City of Los Angeles Community Development Department	215 West 6th Street, 6th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90014	Public	\$7,226,788
4317	Los Angeles County Department of Community and Senior Services	3175 West 6th Street Los Angeles, CA 90020	Public	\$6,600,956
4318	Lake County CAA	14130 Lakeshore Drive Clearlake, CA 95422	Private	\$173,556
4319	Lassen/Plumas/Sierra CAA	183 West Main Street Quincy, CA 95971	Public	\$173,556
4320	Long Beach Community Services Development	780 Atlantic Avenue, Third Floor Long Beach, CA 90813	Private	\$933,229
4321	Madera County CAA	1200 West Maple Street Madera, CA 93637	Private	\$221,207
4322	Community Action Marin	29 Mary Street San Rafael, CA 94901	Private	\$173,556

California Department of Community Services and Development (CSD)
2003 CSBG/IS Part I, Section B
List of Eligible Entities Receiving 2003 Funds

Contract Number	Agency	Address	Public or Private Agency	2003 Award Amount**
Community Action Agencies (continued)				
4323	Merced County CAA	561 W. 18th Street Merced, CA 95344	Public	\$406,323
4324	Modoc-Siskiyou CAA	120 North Main Street Alturas, CA 96101	Public	\$173,556
4325	Monterey County Dept of Social Services	1000 South Main Street, Ste 301 Salinas, CA 93901	Public	\$466,189
4326	Community Action of Napa Valley	1001 "A" Franklin Street Napa, CA 94559	Private	\$223,556
4327	Nevada County Dept of Housing and Community	950 Maidu Avenue Nevada City, CA 95959	Public	\$173,556
4328	North Coast Opportunities	413 North State Street Ukiah, CA 95482	Private	\$173,556
4329	City of Oakland, Dept of Aging	Lionel J. Wilson Building 150 Frank H. Ogawa Plaza Suite 4340 Oakland, CA 94612	Public	\$689,943
4330	Orange County Community Development Council	12640 Knott Street Garden Grove, CA 92841	Private	\$2,611,597
4331	Placer County Health and Human Services Dept	11519 B Avenue Auburn, CA 95603-2602	Public	\$173,556
4332	Redwood Community Action Agency	904 G Street Eureka, CA 95501	Private	\$316,960
4333	Riverside County Dept of Community Action	4060 County Circle Drive Riverside, CA 92503	Public	\$2,111,417
4334	Sacramento Employment and Training Agency	1217 Del Paso Boulevard Sacramento, CA 95815	Public	\$1,531,888
4335	San Benito County Dept of Community Services	1131 San Felipe Road Hollister, CA 95023	Public	\$173,556
4336	San Bernardino County Community Services Dept.	686 East Mill Street San Bernardino, CA 92415-0610	Public	\$2,376,379
4337	County of San Diego, Health and Human Services Agency Community Action Partnership	1255 Imperial Avenue, Suite 743 San Diego, CA 92101-7439	Public	\$3,203,161
4338	Economic Opportunity Commission of San Francisco	1426 Fillmore Street, Suite 301 San Francisco, CA 94115	Private	\$781,229
4339	San Joaquin County Dept of Aging, Children and Community Services	102 South San Joaquin Street Stockton, CA 95201	Public	\$875,909
4340	Economic Opportunity Commission of San Luis Obispo	1030 Southwood Drive San Luis Obispo, CA 93401	Private	\$290,196
4341	CAA of San Mateo County	930 Brittan Avenue San Carlos, CA 94070	Private	\$492,262
4342	CAC of Santa Barbara County	5681 Hollister Avenue Goleta, CA 93117	Private	\$497,184
4343	Community Action Board of Santa Cruz County	501 Soquel Avenue, Suite E Santa Cruz, CA 95062	Private	\$321,938
4344	Shasta County CAA	1670 Market Street, Suite 300 Redding, CA 96001	Public	\$221,631

California Department of Community Services and Development (CSD)

2003 CSBG/IS Part I, Section B

List of Eligible Entities Receiving 2003 Funds

<i>Contract Number</i>	<i>Agency</i>	<i>Address</i>	<i>Public or Private Agency</i>	<i>2003 Award Amount**</i>
Community Action Agencies (continued)				
4345	Solano Safety-Net Consortium	1735 Enterprise Drive, Bldg 1 Fairfield, CA 94533	Private	\$282,770
4346	Sonoma County People for Economic Opportunity	555 Sebastopol Road, Suite A Santa Rosa, CA 95407	Private	\$327,776
4347	Sutter County CAA	938 14th Street Marysville, CA 95901	Private	\$173,556
4348	CAA of Tehama County	624 Washington Street Red Bluff, CA 96080	Public	\$173,556
4349	Ventura County Commission on Human Concerns	621 Richmond Avenue Oxnard, CA 93030	Private	\$693,189
4350	Yolo County Dept of Employment	25 North Cottonwood Street Woodland, CA 95695	Public	\$268,760
4351	Yuba County Community Services Commission	938 -- 14th Street Marysville, CA 95901	Public	\$173,556
4353 & 4357	Central Valley Opportunity Center	1748 Miles Court Merced, CA 95348	Private	\$1,139,433
4354	Del Norte County Board of Supervisors	981 H Street, Suite 210 Crescent City, CA 95531	Private	\$42,883
Community Action Agencies TOTAL				\$45,552,599
Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Agencies				
4355	California Human Development Corp	3315 Airway Drive Santa Rosa, CA 95403	Private	\$1,288,707
4356	Center for Employment Training	701 Vine Street San Jose, CA 95110	Private	\$1,736,952
4358	Proteus, Inc.	1830 N. Dinuba Boulevard Visalia, CA 93291	Private	\$2,073,135
4359	La Cooperativa Campesina de California	7801 Folsom Boulevard, Ste 365 Sacramento, CA 95826	Private	\$216,059
Migrant and Seasonal Farmworker Agencies TOTAL				\$5,314,853

California Department of Community Services and Development (CSD)
2003 CSBG/IS Part I, Section B
List of Eligible Entities Receiving 2003 Funds

<i>Contract Number</i>	<i>Agency</i>	<i>Address</i>	<i>Public or Private Agency</i>	<i>2003 Award Amount**</i>
Native American Indian Agencies				
4360 & 4361	Karuk Tribe of CA	746 Indian Creek Road	Private	\$115,127
4362	Los Angeles County NAI Commission	3175 Westh Sixth Street, Rm 403 Los Angeles, CA 90020	Public	\$261,200
4363 & 4364	Northern CA Indian Development Council	241 F Street	Private	\$1,973,629
Native American Agencies TOTAL				\$2,349,956
Limited Purpose Agencies				
4367	Community Design Center	1705 Ocean Avenue San Francisco, CA 94112	Private	\$123,263
4368	Del Norte Senior Center	1765 North Crest Drive Crescent City, CA 95531	Private	\$89,600
4369	Rural Community Assistance Corporation	3120 Freeboard Drive, Suite 201 West Sacramento, CA 95691	Private	\$138,053
Limited Purpose Agencies TOTAL				\$350,916
2003 CSBG ELIGIBLE ENTITY ALLOCATION TOTAL				\$53,568,324

Attachment B

Other HHS Resources

Attachment B -- Other HHS Resources

Agency Name	I. Other HHS Resources	Amount
Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission	Assests for Independence Demonstration Program	16,000.00
Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission	Basic Center Program	135,000.00
Economic Opportunity Commission of San Luis Obispo Co.	Center for Disease Control	12,864.00
Yuba County Community Services Commission	Child Abuse Neglect Prevention and Treatment	66,219.00
Merced County Community Action Agency	Child and Adult Food Program	116,232.00
Kern County Economic Opportunity Corporation	Community Based Family Resources Services -- Immunization	18,308.00
Yuba County Community Services Commission	Community-Based Family Resource Support	26,447.00
Community Services Department of San Bernardino County	CSBG Program Interest	59,153.00
Ventura County Commission on Human Concerns	CSBG Program Interest	54.00
Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission	Family Planning Services: Family Health Council	120,411.00
Amador-Tuolumne Community Action Agency	Family Resource & Support	52,082.00
Orange County Community Development Council, Inc.	Family Resource Funding	258,163.00
Redwood Community Action Agency	Group Home Foster Care- Humboldt County Department of Social Services	133,683.00
Community Action Partnership of Sonoma	HIV Family Needs	30,000.00
Glenn County Human Resource Agency	Independent Living Program	60,000.00
Proteus, Inc.	Independent Living Program	38,333.00
Community Action Commission of Santa Barbara	Individual Development Account	6,000.00
County of Riverside Department of Community Action	Individual Development Account	250,000.00
Community Action Partnership of Sonoma	Individual Development Account	50,000.00
Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission	Individual Development Account + Enterprise	17,376.00
Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission	Job Opportunities for Low-Income Individuals	233,333.00
Community Action Partnership of Sonoma	Maternal and Child Health Bureau --Healthy Tomorrows	50,000.00
Community Services Department of San Bernardino County	Nutrition For Seniors Program Income	439,520.00
Kern County Economic Opportunity Corporation	Prevention/Treatment of Substance Abuse	70,740.00
Monterey County Dept. Soc. Serv.Comm. Action Agency	Promoting Safe & Stable Families	554,368.00
Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission	Refugee Community Services Employment Opportunity Program/Individual Development Account/Microenterprise Program	508,979.00
County of San Diego	Refugee Services	1,228,488.00
Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission	Runaway & Homeless Youth-Office For Children & Families	100,000.00
Redwood Community Action Agency	Runaway & Homeless Youth-Office For Children & Families	201,039.00
Rural Community Assistance Corporation	Rural Facilities Development	400,000.00
Kern County Economic Opportunity Corporation	Substance Abuse/Mental Health Services	330,824.00
Orange County Community Development Council, Inc.	Summer Lunch Program	2,657.00
Community Action Marin	Title I -- Ryan White	201,883.00
Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission	Title III -- Special Programs for the Aging	68,109.00
Community Action Board of Santa Cruz	Title III-B Seniors Council	3,605.00
Karuk Tribe of California	Title IVB -- Child Welfare Services	4,742.00
Economic Opportunity Commission of San Luis Obispo Co.	Title X	146,888.00
Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission	Title X -- Family Planning	88,526.00
Redwood Community Action Agency	Transitional Living for Homeless Youth-Office For Children & Families	166,060.00
Community Action Board of Santa Cruz	Women Ventures	46,232.00
TOTAL		6,312,318.00

Attachment C

Other Federal Sources

Attachment C -- Other Federal Sources

Agency Name	X. Other Federal Sources	Amount
Karuk Tribe of California	Bureau of Indian Affairs	1,163,931.00
Amador-Tuolumne Community Action Agency	Department of Commerce	67,609.00
Redwood Community Action Agency	Department of Commerce -- National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration -- Habitat Conservation/National Forrest Foundation	279,214.00
Amador-Tuolumne Community Action Agency	Department of Education	235,500.00
Proteus, Inc.	Department of Education -- High School Equivalency	397,100.00
Redwood Community Action Agency	Department of Education - Safe and Drug Free Schools	144,908.00
Redwood Community Action Agency	Department of Interior - Bureau of Land Management	62,577.00
Amador-Tuolumne Community Action Agency	Department of Justice	69,964.00
Ventura County Commission on Human Concerns	Department of the Treasury	15,033.00
Calaveras-Mariposa Community Action Agency	Family Preservation	30,000.00
Inyo-Mono Advocates for Community Action, Inc.	Federal Health and Safety Training	1,162.00
Kings Community Action Organization, Inc.	Office of Criminal Justice Planning	86,902.00
Madera County Community Action Agency	Office of Criminal Justice Planning	220,405.00
Rural Community Assistance Corporation	U. S. Environmental Protection Agency: Tribal Water/Wastewater Technical Assistance	725,542.00
Central Valley Opportunity Center	U.S. Department of Education	160,000.00
County of San Joaquin Department of Aging and Community Services	U.S. Department of Education -- Senior Tutor	77,615.00
Fresno County Economic Opportunities Commission	U.S. Department of Education -- Title I	19,000.00
Economic Opportunity Council of San Luis Obispo	U.S. Department of Justice	116,442.00
Community Services & Employment Training	U.S. Department of Justice - Juvenile Justice	208,220.22
Community Action Commission of Santa Barbara County	US Environmental Protection Agency -- California Intergrated Waste Management Board	64,824.00
Community Action Partnership of Sonoma County	Volunteers In Service America (VISTA)	5,500.00
TOTAL:		4,151,448.22

Attachment D

Other State Sources

Attachment D -- Other State Sources

Agency Name	O. Other State Sources	Amount
California Human Development Corporation	Alternative Diversion Services	120,920.00
Community Action Board of Santa Cruz, Inc.	California Children and Families Commission	26,960.00
Glenn County Human Resource Agency	California Children and Families Commission	30,000.00
Proteus, Inc.	California Children and Families Commission	149,202.00
Inyo Mono Advocates for Community Action, Inc	Child Abuse Prevention	54,000.00
County of San Diego	Child Abuse Prevention & Intervention	663,177.00
County of San Diego	Community Based Family Resource	50,036.00
California Human Development Corporation	Disability Rehabilitation Services	791,410.00
Amador-Tuolumne Community Action Agency	Family Resource Services	60,000.00
Proteus, Inc.	Foster Family Agency	800,000.00
El Dorado County Department of Community Services	In Home Support Services Public Authority	65,200.00
Kings Community Action Organization, Inc.	Maternal and Child Health	192,092.00
North Coast Opportunities, Inc.	Mental Health	882,765.00
California Human Development Corporation	Naturalization Services Program	197,426.00
Community Action Board of Santa Cruz, Inc.	Naturalization Services Program	25,533.00
Economic and Social Opportunities	Naturalization Services Program	169,510.00
La Cooperativa Campesinos de California	Naturalization Services Program Monitoring	247,000.00
Proteus, Inc.	Office Criminal Justice - Domestic Violence Services	211,321.00
Kings Community Action Organization, Inc.	Office Criminal Justice - Sexual Assault Services	27,630.00
Madera County Community Action Agency	Office of Criminal Justice Planning	143,841.00
Glenn County Human Resource Agency	Promoting Safe and Stable Families	30,000.00
Inyo Mono Advocates for Community Action, Inc	Proposition 10 -- Family Self-Sufficiency	211,551.00
California Human Development Corporation	Residential Treatment for Alcohol and Drugs	372,554.00
Total		5,522,128.00

Supporting Document

OCS MATF National Goals and Measures

OCS' Monitoring and Assessment Task Force

National Goals and Outcome Measures

Effective October 1, 1999

For each goal that corresponds to the work your agency does, select at least one measure to report on, based on a current needs assessment survey. If you feel that none of the measures under a particular goal is a good measure of the work actually done by your agency, create a measure that more accurately reflects the work you do. In addition, note that some of the measures could easily apply to other goals as well as the one under which they are listed; use them wherever they seem most appropriate to you.

In measures below, number, wherever it appears, is to be expressed in two parts: the actual count, and the baseline total. For example, when the measure is number of households maintaining employment, express it as a factor of the total number of households served by the agency (e.g., 27 out of 86). Do not indicate percentages (e.g., 31.4% or even 31 out of 100, unless your baseline total is actually 100 households); the data need to be aggregated with that of other agencies before percentages are calculated.

GOAL 1. (Self-sufficiency) LOW-INCOME PEOPLE BECOME MORE SELF-SUFFICIENT

GOAL 2. (Community Revitalization) THE CONDITIONS IN WHICH LOW-INCOME PEOPLE LIVE ARE IMPROVED

GOAL 3. (Community Revitalization) LOW-INCOME PEOPLE OWN A STAKE IN THEIR COMMUNITY

GOAL 4. PARTNERSHIPS AMONG SUPPORTERS AND PROVIDERS OF SERVICES TO LOW-INCOME PEOPLE ARE ACHIEVED

GOAL 5. AGENCIES INCREASE THEIR CAPACITY TO ACHIEVE RESULTS

GOAL 6. (Family stability) LOW-INCOME PEOPLE, ESPECIALLY VULNERABLE POPULATIONS, ACHIEVE THEIR POTENTIAL BY STRENGTHENING FAMILY AND OTHER SUPPORTIVE SYSTEMS

GOAL 1: (SELF-SUFFICIENCY)

LOW-INCOME PEOPLE BECOME MORE SELF-SUFFICIENT

Direct measures:

- a. Number of participants seeking employment who obtain it [as compared with the total number of participants].
- b. Number of participants maintaining employment for a full twelve months.
- c. Number of households in which adult members obtain and maintain employment for at least ninety days.
- d. Number of households with an annual increase in the number of hours of employment.
- e. Number of households gaining health care coverage through employment.
- f. Number of households experiencing an increase in an annual income as a result of earnings.
- g. Number of households experiencing an increase in annual income as a result of receiving allowable tax credits, such as the earned income and child care tax credits.
- h. Number of custodial households who experience an increase in annual income as a result of regular child support payments.
- i. Number of participating families moving from substandard housing into stable standard housing, as compared with the total number of participating families.
- j. Number of households which obtain and/or maintain home ownership.
- k. Number of minority households which obtain and/or maintain home ownership.
- l. Number of people progressing toward literacy and/or GED.
- m. Number of people making progress toward post-secondary degree or vocational training.
- n. Other outcome measure(s) specific to the work of your agency.

Survey question measures:

- o. Number of clients who consider themselves more self-sufficient since participating in services or activities of the agency.
- p. Number of clients reporting an increase in income since participating in the services of the agency.

Scale measures:

- q. Number of households which demonstrated movement up one or more steps on a scale or matrix measuring self-sufficiency
- r. Number of households achieving positive movement in self-sufficiency as demonstrated by an increase of at least one point in an overall score of a Family Development Scale.
- s. Number of households achieving stability in the _____ dimension of a Family Development Matrix.

GOAL 2: (COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION)

THE CONDITIONS IN WHICH LOW-INCOME PEOPLE LIVE ARE IMPROVED

Direct Measures:

- a. Number of accessible, living wage jobs created and/or retained.
- b. Increase in assessed value of homes as a result of rehabilitation projects.
- c. Increase in proportion of state and federal funds allocated for meeting emergency and long-term needs of the low-income population.
- d. Increase in access to community services and resources by low-income people.
- e. Increase in available housing stock through new construction.
- f. Increase in the availability and affordability of essential services, e.g. transportation, medical care, child care.
- g. Other outcome measure(s) specific to the work done by your agency.

Survey question measures:

- h. Number of households who believe the agency has helped improve the conditions in which they live.

Scale measures:

- i. Number of communities which demonstrated movement up one or more steps on a scale or matrix measuring community self-sufficiency, community health, or community vitality.
- j. Number of communities achieving stability in the _____ dimension of the Community Scaling Tool.

GOAL 3: (COMMUNITY REVITALIZATION)

LOW-INCOME PEOPLE OWN A STAKE IN THEIR COMMUNITY

Direct measures:

- a. Number of households owning or actively participating in the management of their housing.
- b. Amount of "community investment" brought into the community by the Network and targeted to low-income people.
- c. Increase in minority businesses owned.
- d. Increase in access to capital by minorities.
- e. Increased level of participation of low-income people in advocacy and intervention activities regarding funding levels, distribution policies, oversight, and distribution procedures for programs and funding streams targeted for the low-income community.
- f. Other outcome measure(s) specific to the work done by your agency.

Survey question measures:

- g. Number of households participating or volunteering in one or more groups.
- h. Number of households who say they feel they are part of the community.

Scale measures

- i. Number of communities which demonstrated movement up one or more steps on a scale or matrix measuring community self-sufficiency, community health, or community vitality.
- j. Number of communities achieving stability in the _____ dimension of the Community Scaling Tool.

GOAL 4:

PARTNERSHIPS AMONG SUPPORTERS AND PROVIDERS OF SERVICES TO LOW-INCOME PEOPLE ARE ACHIEVED

Direct measures:

- a. Number of partnerships established and/or maintained with other public and private entities to mobilize and leverage resources to provide services to low-income people.
- b. Number of partnerships established and/or maintained with other public and private entities to complete the continuum of care for low-income people.
- c. Number of partnerships established and/or maintained with other public and private entities which ensure ethnic, cultural, and other special needs considerations are appropriately included in the delivery service system.
- d. Other outcome measure(s) specific to the partnerships created by local agencies.

Survey question measures:

- e. Number of principal partners who are satisfied with the partnership.
- f. Partner's rating of the responsiveness of the agency.

Scale Measures:

- g. Number of agencies which demonstrated movement up one or more steps on a scale or matrix measuring agency partnership capacity.
- h. Number of agencies achieving stability in the _____ dimension of an agency partnership capacity scaling tool.
- i. Number of agencies that achieve and maintain commitments from other service and resource partners to carry out agency mission.
- j. Number of agencies that establish and maintain commitments to provide resources to partner organizations that serve agency customers.
- k. Number of agencies that establish and maintain coordination of agency and non-agency resources to create a programmatic continuum of services with outcome-based objectives establishes and maintains a selection process which ensures that low-income community members are elected in a public process.

GOAL 5:**AGENCIES INCREASE THEIR CAPACITY TO ACHIEVE RESULTS****Direct measures:**

- a. Total dollars mobilized by the agency.
- b. Total dollars mobilized by the agency as compared with CSBG dollars.
- c. Number of boards making changes as a result of a periodic organizational assessment.
- d. Number of programs which have become more effective as a result of research and data (their own as well as others).
- e. Number of programs which have become more effective as a result of needs assessment surveys.
- f. Number of families having their situation improved as a result of comprehensive developmental services.
- g. Increase in community revitalization as a result of programs.
- h. Number of agencies increasing their number of funding sources and increasing the total value of resources available for services to low-income people.
- i. Number of agencies leveraging non-CSBG resources with CSBG resources at a ratio greater than 1:1.
- j. Number of agencies where board composition accurately represents the ethnic diversity of the service territory.
- k. Number of agencies where customers served accurately represents the ethnic diversity of the service territory.
- l. Number of agencies where staffing component accurately represents the ethnic diversity of the service territory.
- m. Number of development contacts as a result of outreach programs.
- n. Number of special populations showing improvement as a result of programs aimed at the population.
- o. Number of clients showing improvement as a result of emergency services received.
- p. Other outcome measure(s) specific to the work done by local agencies.

Scale measures:

- q. Number of agencies that achieve and maintain compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local statutes, regulations, and requirements.
- r. Number of agencies that achieve and maintain a governance process that is inclusive, representative of, and accountable to the community.
- s. Number of agencies that achieve and maintain a workforce environment which empowers and develops its employees, has open communications, pays its employees a living wage, and is mission-driven.
- t. Number of agencies which achieve and maintain a planning, measurement, and an evaluation system which creates a programmatic, continuum of services with outcomes-based objectives, and where the measurements of programs are used to improve services.

- u. Number of agencies that achieve and maintain communication and feedback processes that engage all stakeholders.
- v. Number of agencies that establish and maintain a process where evaluations are used to improve services.

GOAL 6: (Family stability)

LOW-INCOME PEOPLE, ESPECIALLY VULNERABLE POPULATIONS, ACHIEVE THEIR POTENTIAL BY STRENGTHENING FAMILY AND OTHER SUPPORTIVE SYSTEMS

Direct measures:

- a. Number of aged households maintaining an independent living situation.
- b. Number of disabled or medically challenged persons maintaining an independent living situation.
- c. Number of households in crisis whose emergency needs are ameliorated.
- d. Number of participating families moving from homeless or transitional housing into stable standard housing.
- e. Number of households in which there has been an increase in donation of time to volunteer activities (not mandated by welfare-to-work programs).
- f. Number of households in which there has been an increase in children's involvement in extracurricular activities.
- g. Number of high consumption households realizing a reduction in energy burden.
- h. Number of households moving from cultural isolation to involvement with their cultural community.
- i. Other outcome measure(s) specific to the work done by your agency.

Survey question measure:

- j. Number of households indicating improved family functioning since participating in the services or activities of the agency.

Scale measures:

- k. Number of households moving from crisis to stability on one dimension of a scale.
- l. Number of households moving from vulnerability to stability on one dimension of a scale.
- m. Number of households moving from a condition of crisis to a condition of vulnerability on one dimension of a scale.

Supporting Document

CSD 415

Statewide Aggregation Total by Goal Number

Goal 1: (Self-Sufficiency) Low-income people become more self-sufficient.

OCS Measure Letter	Outcome Measures:	# of Units (# to be served)	Expected to Achieve Outcome (Goal)	Achieved	Still Progressing Toward Outcome	Exited Program Prior to Achieving Outcome
Education -- Adult Education & Development and Youth Education & Development						
q	Number of households which demonstrated movement up one or more steps in <u>Adult Education and Development</u> using the Family Development Matrix.	5,028	2,404	1,759	2,037	314
s	Number of households achieving stability in the <u>Adult Education and Development</u> Dimension on the Family Development Matrix.	3,178	2,395	1,842	1,676	575
q	Number of households which demonstrated movement up one or more steps in <u>Youth Education and Development</u> using the Family Development Matrix.	7,927	5,782	7,143	1,910	527
s	Number of households achieving stability in the <u>Youth Education and Development</u> Dimension on the Family Development Matrix.	7,339	4,588	6,395	1,653	463
l	Number of people progressing towards and achieving literacy and/or GED. (include Adults and Youth)	5,039	3,368	3,243	1,141	460
m	Number of people making progress towards and achieving a post-secondary degree or vocational training.	3,417	2,337	3,050	1,425	420
q	Number of households which demonstrated movement up one or more steps in <u>Employment</u> using the Family Development Matrix.	6,633	3,851	3,577	2,759	772
s	Number of households achieving stability in the <u>Employment</u> Dimension of the Family Development Matrix.	5,084	4,315	3,274	2,356	1,273
a	Number of participants seeking employment who obtained it [as compared with the total number of participants.]	3,756	3,072	3,151	1,850	819
Income Management -- Income & Budget						
q	Number of households which demonstrated movement up one or more steps in <u>Income & Budget</u> using the Family Development Matrix.	36,729	35,731	68,122	2,147	234
s	Number of households achieving stability in the <u>Income & Budget</u> Dimension of the Family Development Matrix.	38,874	37,659	69,651	751	683
f	Number of households experiencing an increase in an annual income as a result of earnings.	35,368	17,639	33,318	254	109
Linkages -- Transportation & Mobility						
q	Number of households which demonstrated movement up one or more steps in <u>Transportation & Mobility</u> using the Family Development Matrix.	1,245	875	1,096	292	56
s	Number of households achieving stability in the <u>Transportation and Mobility</u> Dimension of the Family Development Matrix.	1,847	1,418	1,241	377	277
Housing -- Shelter						
q	Number of households which demonstrated movement up one or more steps in <u>Shelter</u> using the Family Development Matrix.	3,037	2,392	5,309	1,257	468
s	Number of households achieving stability in the <u>Shelter</u> Dimension of the Family Development Matrix.	4,123	3,114	4,534	1,225	1,013
i	Total number of participating families in your shelter program who moved from substandard housing into stable housing. (as compared to the total number of participating families.)	2,095	979	1,430	622	231
j	Number of households which obtain and/or maintain home ownership.	458	202	179	111	14
k	Number of minority households which obtain and/or maintain home ownership.	370	190	147	62	9

Summary

Goal 2: (Community Revitalization)

The conditions in which low-income people live are improved.

OCS Measure Letter	Outcome Measures:	# of Units (# to be served)	Expected to Achieve Outcome (Goal)	Achieved	Still Progressing Toward Outcome	Exited Program Prior to Achieving Outcome
Linkages -- Public Policy and Equity						
c	Increase in proportion of state and federal funds allocated for meeting emergency and long-term needs of the low-income population.		1,233,615	1,233,615		
d	Amount of increased access to community services and resources by low-income people in your community. (ie. Jobs, homes, transportation, medical care, child care, etc.)		1,257,694	1,276,403		
i	Number of communities which demonstrated movement up one or more steps in the <u>Public Policy and/or Equity</u> Dimensions on the Community Development Matrix.	12	12	12		
j	Number of communities achieving stability in the <u>Public Policy and/or Equity</u> Dimensions on the Community Development Matrix.	7	7	8		

Summary
Goal 3: (Community Revitalization)
Low-Income people own a stake in their community.

OCS Measure Letter	Outcome Measures:	# of Units (# to be served)	Expected to Achieve Outcome (Goal)	Achieved	Still Progressing Toward Outcome	Exited Program Prior to Achieving Outcome
Linkages -- Service & Support Systems, Civic Capital and Economic Opportunity						
b	Amount of "community investment" (in dollars) brought into the community by the Network and targeted to low-income people.		18,200,322.00	18,527,073.00		
e	Increased level of participation of low-income people in advocacy and intervention activities regarding funding levels, distribution policies, oversight, and distribution procedures for programs and funding streams targeted for the low-income community.	5,057	3,307.00	3,436.00	342	
i	Number of communities which demonstrated movement up one or more steps in <u>Service and Support Systems, Civic Capital and/or Economic Opportunity Dimensions</u> on the Community Development Matrix.	297	283	678	13	
j	Number of communities achieving stability in <u>Service and Support Systems, Civic Capital and/or Economic Opportunity Dimensions</u> on the Community Development Matrix.	107	48	36	16	

Summary

Goal 4:

Partnerships among supporters and providers of services to low-income people are achieved.

OCS Measure Letter	Outcome Measures:	# of Units (# to be served)	Expected to Achieve Outcome (Goal)	Achieved	Still Progressing Toward Outcome	Exited Program Prior to Achieving Outcome
Linkages -- Collaboration						
a	Number of partnerships established and/or maintained with other public and private entities to mobilize and leverage resources to provide services to low-income people.	1,254	1,238	1,444	21	
b	Number of partnerships established and/or maintained with other public and private entities to complete the continuum of care for low-income people.	461	458	653	9	
c	Number of partnerships established and/or maintained with other public and private entities which ensure ethnic, cultural and other special needs considerations are appropriately included in the delivery services system.	776	774	789	21	
g	Did your agency demonstrate movement up one or more steps in the <u>Collaboration</u> dimension on the Agency Development Matrix? (Yes = 1, No = Blank)			23		
i	Did your agency achieve and maintain commitments from other service and resource partners to carry out agency mission? (Yes = 1, No = Blank)			34		
j	Did your agency establish and maintain commitments to provide resources to partner organizations that serve agency customers? (Yes = 1, No = Blank)			34		
k	Did your agency establish and maintain coordination of agency and non-agency resources to create a programmatic continuum of services with outcome-based objectives establishes and maintains a selection process which ensures that low-income community membe			25		

Summary
Goal 5:
Agencies increase their capacity to achieve results.

OCS Measure Letter	Outcome Measures:	# of Units (# to be served)	Expected to Achieve Outcome (Goal)	Achieved	Still Progressing Toward	Exited Program Prior to Achieving Outcome
Linkages						
a	Total dollars mobilized by the agency.		\$172,213,350.00	\$223,191,662.90		
b	Total CSBG dollars			\$29,623,639.00		
c	Did your agency's board make any changes as a result of periodic assessment. (Yes = 1, No = Blank)		21	28		
d	Number of programs which have become more effective as a result of research and data (their own as well as others.)	165	156	173	45	
e	Number of programs which have become more effective as a result of needs assessment surveys.	164	158	161	53	
f	Number of families having their situation improved as a result of comprehensive developmental services.	13,619	11,363	11,379	2,468	874
h	Did your agency increase the number of funding sources and increase the total value of resources available for services to low-income people? (Yes = 1, No = Blank)			36		
i	Did your agency leverage non-CSBG resources with CSBG resources at a ratio greater than 1:1? (Yes = 1, No = Blank)			32		
j	Does your agency's board composition accurately represent the ethnic diversity of the service territory? (Yes = 1, No = Blank)			41		
k	Does your agency's customers served accurately represents the ethnic diversity of the service territory? (Yes = 1, No = Blank)			40		
l	Does your agency's staffing component accurately represent the ethnic diversity of the service territory? (Yes = 1, No = Blank)			40		
m	Number of development contacts as a result of outreach programs.	1,235	732	1,733	61	
n	Number of special populations showing improvement as a result of programs aimed at the population.	72	69	72	9	1
q	Did your agency achieve and maintain compliance with all applicable Federal, State and local statutes, regulations and requirements? (Yes = 1, No = Blank)			41		
r	Did your agency achieve and maintain a governance process that is inclusive, representative of, and accountable to the community? (Yes = 1, No = Blank)			39		
s	Did your agency achieve and maintain a workforce environment which empowers and develops its employees, has open communications, pays its employees a living wage, and is mission-driven? (Yes = 1, No = Blank)			42		
t	Did your agency achieve and maintain a planning, measurement and evaluation system which creates a programmatic, continuum of services with outcome-based objectives, and where the measurements of programs are used to improve services? (Yes = 1, No = Blank)			36		
u	Did your agency achieve and maintain communication and feedback processes that engage all stakeholders? (Yes = 1, No = Blank)			39		
v	Did your agency establish and maintain a process where evaluations are used to improve services? (Yes = 1, No = Blank)			40		
Emergency Services -- Safety-Net Services						
o	Number of clients showing improvement as a result of emergency services received.	295,525	273,205	584,746	5,072	2,089

Summary

Goal 6: (Family Stability)

Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive systems.

OCS Measure Letter	Outcome Measures:	# of Units (# to be served)	Expected to Achieve Outcome (Goal)	Achieved	Still Progressing Toward Outcome	Exited Program Prior to Achieving Outcome
Nutrition -- Food & Nutrition						
k	Number of households moving from in-crisis to stability in the <u>Food and Nutrition</u> Dimension on the Family Development Matrix.	228,867	204,628	241,008	26,565	42,894
m	Number of households moving from in-crisis to vulnerable in the <u>Food and Nutrition</u> Dimension of the Family Development Matrix.	962,685	948,522	764,355	10,893	67,425
Emergency Services -- Safety-Net Services						
c	Number of households in-crisis whose emergency needs were ameliorated. (Services can include, but not limited to: weatherization, utility assistance, legal services [non-case managed], shelter [bed nights, hotel vouchers], brown bag lunches, etc.)	628,459	615,191	887,639	7,320	465
g	Number of high consumption households realizing a reduction in energy burden.	25,056	20,788	25,213	953	65
k	Number of household moving from in-crisis to stability.	1,101,561	778,472	1,017,178	2,939	585
m	Number of households moving from in-crisis to vulnerable.	496,822	413,362	589,373	3,070	507
Health -- Health, Social & Emotional Health Competency and Family Relations and Parenting						
k	Number of households moving from in-crisis to stability in the <u>Health</u> Dimension on the Family Development Matrix.	12,983	11,254	9,571	694	2,476
m	Number of households moving from in-crisis to vulnerable in the <u>Health</u> Dimension of the Family Development Matrix.	5,815	1,910	2,248	70	36
k	Number of households moving from in-crisis to stability in the <u>Social & Emotional Health Competency</u> Dimension on the Family Development Matrix.	4,876	4,240	4,046	607	765
m	Number of households moving from in-crisis to vulnerable in the <u>Social & Emotional Health Competency</u> Dimension of the Family Development Matrix.	3,888	1,403	2,525	100	137
k	Number of households moving from in-crisis to stability in the <u>Family Relations & Parenting</u> Dimension on the Family Development Matrix.	3,685	2,585	2,346	717	646
m	Number of households moving from in-crisis to vulnerable in the <u>Family Relations & Parenting</u> Dimension of the Family Development Matrix.	6,102	3,433	2,475	383	178
Linkages -- Community Involvement						
e	Number of households in which there has been an increase in donation of time to volunteer activities (not mandated by welfare-to-work programs).	2,088	1,230	2,645	857	423
f	Number of households in which there has been an increase in children's involvement in extracurricular activities.	2,692	1,783	3,187	1,047	30
k	Number of households moving from in-crisis to stability in the <u>Community Involvement</u> Dimension on the Family Development Matrix.	543	438	510	55	28
m	Number of households moving from in-crisis to vulnerable in the <u>Community Involvement</u> dimension of the Family Development Matrix.	2,916	2,794	3,256	631	11
Housing -- Shelter						
k	Number of households moving from in-crisis to stability in the <u>Shelter</u> Dimension on the Family Development Matrix.	2,034	1,141	2,151	453	228
m	Number of households moving from in-crisis to vulnerable in the <u>Shelter</u> Dimension of the Family Development Matrix.	4,929	4,679	6,474	2,679	253
d	Number of participating families who moved from homelessness or transitional housing into stable standard housing.	1,405	935	1,098	518	136